A U M

He who lives looking for pleasures only, his senses uncontrolled, immoderate in his enjoyments, idle and weak, Mara (the tempter) will certainly overcome him, as the wind throws down a weak tree. —DHAMMAPADA.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXIV August, 1936 No. 10

Typ. 33/1450

GREAT THEOSOPHISTS

FIRST CENTURY CHRISTIANITY

THEOSOPHY is the ancient Wisdom-Religion, as old as thinking man, and part of the work of the Theosophical Movement is to keep these immemorial ideas alive in the world, so that men and women can live intelligently and purposefully.

Jesus the Christ was a member of that great Fraternity of Adepts which stands behind the Theosophical Movement. His aim and purpose, therefore, was to promulgate the fundamental principles of the ancient Wisdom-Religion, to exemplify those principles in practice, to give the world a truer realization of the SELF and a profounder conviction of Universal Brotherhood. Jesus did not come to found a *new* religion, but to purify the old religion of its dross. He did not come to bring *new* dogmas, but to replace with universal principles the narrow dogmatism that had crept into the Jewish religion. He did not come to establish a *new* form of priestcraft, but to destroy the power of the priests and give knowledge to the people themselves. Human nature was the same then as it is now, however, and the Prophet of Galilee met the same fate that has befallen most of the representatives of the Theosophical Movement who incarnated with but one purpose — to benefit mankind. The *impersonal* doctrines that he taught were soon perverted by his *personal* followers, and the bond of Brotherhood that he tried to establish was soon rent asunder by creeds and sects.

Apollonius of Tyana was a member of this same Fraternity. His aim and purpose was identical with that of Jesus. He promulgated the same impersonal truths, taught the same noble ethics, led the same life of self-sacrifice and altruism that Jesus had led. Yet, there

is no record that Jesus and Apollonius ever met. This, however, can easily be explained. For Jesus, as has been shown, lived in the first century B. C., while Apollonius lived in the first century A. D., and even if Jesus' life did extend into the so-called Christian era, he must have spent those years teaching in Judea, while Apollonius was busy in Aegea and Antioch.

When Apollonius returned from India after spending thirteen years with the Sages of Kashmir, he went back to the city of Antioch where he had formerly resided. According to Church history, both Peter and Paul were in Antioch at the time, and there was a large Christian community in the city. But, strange as it may seem, Apollonius made no effort to contact either the Apostles or the Christians. Why was that?

In the first chapter of the *Ocean of Theosophy,* Mr. Judge makes a statement, the importance of which is sometimes overlooked. He speaks of Apollonius as an Adept who appeared at a descending cycle, and only for the purpose of keeping a witness upon the scene for future generations.

If it seems strange that the Christian era is described as a *descending,* rather than an *ascending* cycle, we have but to compare the religious, philosophical and intellectual condition of the world around 500-600 B. C. with its condition around 500-600 A. D., to realize the truth of Mr. Judge's statement.

Why then was a witness needed in this first century of the Christian era? So that the Wisdom-Religion might be kept alive and the line of the Theosophical Movement remain unbroken. If the followers of Jesus had been capable of performing this task, no other "witness" would have been necessary. The fact that Apollonius appeared to perform his mission at this particular time should give the world much food for thought; but we will now look at the other side of the picture and see how the early Christians performed theirs.

The first Christians were drawn from three sects. Some of them were Essenes and *Therapeutae,* members of that same mystical sect with whom Jesus had studied in Egypt; others were Nazarenes; the rest were Ebionites. The first Christian community was composed of small groups, scattered about and organized into secret societies, with their own passwords, grips and signs of recognition. All of them were, with slight differences, followers of the ancient Theurgic Mysteries. All of them more or less kabalistic. And, in

spite of the fact that Jesus had gained his knowledge from them, all of them were doomed within the next two hundred years to be denounced as "heretics" by the Church. Of these three original sects, only one has survived in its integrity, and because it still exists, unaltered, it may be interesting to trace its genesis and growth.

After Jesus had returned from Egypt, he came and dwelt in the city of Nazareth, "so that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet: 'He shall be called a Nazarene.' " The Nazarenes were the descendants of the ancient Chaldean Initiates. They were a philosophical sect, and were naturally opposed to the worship of the *personal* God Jehovah, which was then so prevalent in Judea. In place of the *personal* god idea, the Nazarenes substituted the impersonal Principle which present-day Theosophists call the Absolute. In place of the theory of the *creation* of the world they substituted the doctrine of Emanations. They must therefore be considered as one of the early Gnostic sects.

At the time of which we are speaking, the Nazarenes themselves were divided into several different sects, one of them being known as the Ebionites. The Ebionites were the pupils and followers of the *early* Nazarenes, and at that time John the Baptist was their Prophet. While Jesus was living in Egypt, his cousin John had affiliated himself with the Ebionites, and had made so much of the ancient Chaldean rite of baptism which they practiced that he had become known as "John the Baptist" instead of "John the Ebionite." According to the *Codex Nazaraeus,* John had been baptizing for forty-two years when Jesus came to him and was baptized by him in the river Jordan. This would make Jesus over sixty years old at the time of his baptism.

Many of Jesus' immediate relatives belonged to this sect of the Ebionites. After Jesus' death they were driven out of their native land by bitter persecutions, and finally found refuge in Persia. And there today the traveller may converse with the direct descendants of these "Disciples of St. John" who listened to the "man sent from God" and were baptized by him in the river Jordan. These "Disciples of St. John" and their modern descendants, the Mendaeans, do not believe in the divinity or the uniqueness of Jesus, but consider him merely as one of the great Prophets. They do not read the Christian Scriptures, but confine themselves to the document which contains many of the esoteric teachings of Jesus — the *original* Gospel of Matthew.

Jesus, like all other great spiritual reformers, divided his teachings into two parts: exoteric and esoteric. His exoteric teachings were given out to the multitude in the form of parables, and consisted for the most part of the same ethical rules which had been taught by his predecessor, Gautama the Buddha. His esoteric teachings were reserved for the *few*. As the Gospel of St. Mark records:

> "Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the Kingdom of God; but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables. That seeing, they might see and not perceive; and hearing they may hear and not understand." *Mark* iv:11-12.

Although Jesus does not seem to have established a regular esoteric school of His own, as Apollonius did, there was one document which contained many of his secret, or esoteric teachings. This was the *original* Gospel of Matthew, written in the Chaldaic language, but with Hebrew letters, by an Evangelist who was the close friend and companion of Jesus. This *Logia* of Matthew, which contains the "Sayings of Jesus" mentioned by Papias, is the only half-original document that has come down to us from those primitive days. These "Sayings" were of the same nature as the small manuscripts put into the hands of neophytes who were preparing themselves for initiation into the Mysteries, and contained the revelation of many important rites and symbols. Like the *Aporrheta,* or secret discourses of the Mysteries, these *Logia* could be understood only with a key.

Modern scholars generally agree as to the authenticity of this document, basing their conclusions upon the many references to it that are found in the works of early writers. In the year 140 A. D. Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, wrote:

> "Matthew, however, composed the *Logia* in the Hebrew dialect, but each one interpreted them as he was able."

Forty years later, Papias' statement was corroborated by his pupil, Irenaeus. In the second century parts of this Gospel came to light in the works of Basilides, the Christian Gnostic, who claimed that he had been instructed by Matthew himself. In the fourth century a copy of this document fell into the hands of the Church Father St. Jerome, who found it in the Library collected by Pamphilus in Caesarea, and was commanded to translate it by the two Bishops Chromatius and Heliodorus. He made the translation under protest, for he recognized its esoteric character. Writing under the name of Hieronymus, Jerome says:

> "A difficult work is enjoined, since this translation is commanded by your Felicities, which St. Matthew himself, the Apostle and Evangelist, did not wish to be openly written. For if it had not been secret, he (Matthew) would have added to the Evangel that what he gave forth was his. But he made up the book *sealed in the Hebrew characters,* which he put forth in such a way that the book might be possessed only by the men most religious."

By his own confession, Jerome admits that this Gospel contained the *real* teachings of Jesus. He must have realized that of the two Gospels of Matthew — the one written in Hebrew and the other in Greek — one must be spurious. Why then did the Church choose to perpetuate the Greek, instead of the original Hebrew Gospel? The answer is not difficult to find. If it had adopted the original Gospel, the very foundations of the Church would have been shattered. For in that Gospel it was not the divinity of the *man* Jesus that was proclaimed, but the divinity of the *Christos-principle* that lies latent in every man. And so, according to his own confession found in Book II of his *Commentary to Matthew,* Jerome deliberately substituted the Greek Gospel for the Hebrew, the one in our present Canon evidently having been written by Jerome himself. And so, owing to the efforts of this too zealous Church Father, the very meaning of the terms *Chrestos* and *Christos* has now become a dead letter to the Christian world.

The unity of the primitive Christian community was of short duration, for it soon split up into two distinct branches. The first branch may be called the Christian Kabalists of the Jewish Tanäim School; the second, the Christian Kabalists of the Platonic Gnosis. The first branch represented the Jewish faction of Christianity; the second, the Gentile, or pagan faction. The first was represented by the followers of Peter; the second by the followers of Paul.

Secular history is just as reticent about Peter as it is about Jesus, and Church history just as full of contradictions. And so again, as in the case of Jesus, we must turn to that section of the Talmud known as *Sepher Toldos Jeshu* for information that is at least consistent. This book describes Peter as a Jew, "a faithful servant of the living God," a man given over to austerities and meditation, who lived in Babylon at the top of a tower. It also credits Peter with having invented a burning hell and threatening every one with it, and speaks of him as a man who *promised* miracles, but performed none.

Peter was claimed by the Jews as one of their own brethren, faithful to the *old* Law, a defender of the Old Testament, and an apostle of circumcision. Peter therefore represents the Jewish faction of the early Christian Church. The Jewish tendencies of this faction are admitted by all Christian historians. The eminent Catholic historian, the Reverend Father George Stebbing, C.SS.R. says in his *Story of the Catholic Church:*

> "The Church at Jerusalem was of course entirely Jewish, and being composed mainly of those who had been most zealous for the Law, its members in great part still clung to its observance, and some went so far as to think that any Gentiles who embraced Christianity would by the very act bind themselves to the Mosaic Law *which all the first disciples of Our Lord had been trained to keep.* And, coming from Judea to Antioch, they put pressure on the Christians there to make them do likewise, at least in the matter of circumcision."

Considering the fact that Peter, the Founder of the Church of Rome, was a circumcised Jew, that (according to Eusebius) the first fifteen Christian Bishops were also circumcised Jews, and that "all the first disciples of Our Lord" had been trained to keep the Mosaic Law, why then did the Church make such an effort to depart from that Law? But the Reverend Father Stebbing continues:

> "Paul and Barnabas came forward as spokesmen of the *opposite* view. This decree, which was a victory over the Judaizing tendencies of some of the early Christians, must have helped and secured Paul in his Apostolate."

In other words, Paul secured his Apostolate by going *against* the very Law which "all the first disciples of Our Lord had been trained to keep." This matter of circumcision seems to have been an important issue with the early Christians, for Paul says:

> "The gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter." *Galatians* ii:7.

In these very words is found one of the many reasons why an outside "witness" was required upon the scene. For they show that, even at this early date, the Christians were not concerning themselves primarily and entirely with the philosophical and ethical precepts of their great Teacher, but with *side issues.* What has circumcision to do with the spiritual life? If it was as important as the early Christians considered it to be, which of the two "gospels" was correct: the gospel of circumcision committed unto Peter, or the gospel of uncircumcision committed unto Paul? The Church

of Rome must have considered the first "gospel" as the correct one, for it acknowledges that the twelve circumcised disciples were chosen to be the foundations of the new City of God, and that Peter, the circumcised Jew and the apostle of circumcision, was chosen as the Rock upon which the Church was to be built. As the Reverend Father Stebbing says:

> "The twelve disciples were chosen to be the twelve foundations of the new City of God. One of their number was chosen out, given the new name of Peter, and declared to be the Rock upon which His Church was to rest. Given the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, he was to open and shut its gates with full commission of authority in the name of its King."

If Jesus used the word "Peter," what did he mean by it? Was it Peter the *man?* Would any great Adept like Jesus choose a *personality* as the foundation of his work? Would he deliberately choose for that responsible position the only disciple, save Judas, who denied him at the moment of danger, the only one, furthermore whom he addressed as *Satan?*

> "And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. But when he had turned about and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Peter, saying: Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men." *Mark* viii:32.

There is a tradition in the Greek Church that has never found favor in the Vatican. It shows Jesus' recognition of the chain of causes that was even then being forged. This tradition states that Peter, frightened at the accusation of the High Priest, denied his Master three times just before the cock crowed. Jesus, who was then passing through the hall in the custody of the soldiers, turned to Peter and said:

> "Verily I say unto thee, Peter, thou shalt deny me through the ages, and shalt never stop until thou shalt be old, and shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee and carry thee whither thou wouldst not."

Can we then believe that it was Peter, the *unfaithful disciple,* whom Jesus chose to be his successor? If not, what then did Jesus mean by the word *Peter?*

Jesus had been initiated into both the Chaldean and Egyptian Mysteries. The word *Peter* comes from the Mysteries. It was the Chaldean title of the Supreme Hierophant, and meant *an inter-*

preter. As Professor Alexander Wilder points out in his *Introduction to the Bacchic and Eleusinian Mysteries:*

> "In the Oriental countries the designation of Peter (in Phoenician and Chaldean, an *interpreter*) appears to have been the title of the Hierophant."

Therefore if Jesus used the word *Peter,* he must have meant that any one who was capable of carrying on his work must be an *interpreter of the Mysteries.* As Peter, the disciple, had never been initiated into the Mysteries, how could Jesus have chosen him to be their interpreter?

There is another word in the Mysteries which throws additional light upon Jesus' statement: "Upon this Rock will I found my Church." That word is *Petra,* meaning a Rock and referring to the Rock-temple, and by metaphor to the Mysteries. Hence the Rock upon which Jesus' work was founded must have been the Mysteries themselves.

During the final initiations into the Mysteries, a double set of stone tablets, called the *Petroma,* was used by the Hierophant. The combination of the two words *Peter* and *Roma,* forming the word *Petroma,* gave the Church still another opportunity to profit by the name of the disciple. The idea of the Keys given to Peter to unlock the gates of Heaven also comes from the Mysteries. There the Key was used to symbolize the vow of secrecy taken by the candidate, which would forever lock his lips. It also symbolized the unlocking of hitherto impenetrable mysteries to which his initiation would entitle him. And so in the Mysteries themselves we find the solution to the mystery of Peter.

Although Peter is claimed by the Church of Rome as its titular founder, the history of his life, even from Catholic sources, seems to be based upon assumption. The Reverend Father Stebbing says:

> "St. Peter is *supposed* to have gone first to Rome. The *accepted* period of twenty-five years for his episcopate in the city of Rome is dated from this time. *We now lose sight of Peter* in the Acts, and are *left to conjecture* the details of his further career."

Many modern critics are of the opinion that Peter was never in Rome at all. Justin Martyr, the great champion of Christianity, whom the Reverend Father Stebbing calls "the most valuable witness to the Faith," wrote extensively *in Rome* during the second century. And yet, strange as it may seem, Justin appears to be ignorant of Peter's existence. Neither does any other writer of

consequence mention Peter in connection with the Church of Rome earlier than the days of Irenaeus.

The reason for the first split in Christianity becomes still more apparent when we observe the difference between Peter and Paul. Where Peter was an "unlearned and ignorant man" (*Acts* iv:13), Paul was learned, a Greek scholar, a student of the Gnosis. There is no doubt that Paul had been partially, if not completely, initiated into the Mysteries. His choice of language, the phraseology so peculiar to Greek philosophers, certain expressions used only by Initiates, all point to the position he had attained. His name is a further indication of the same fact.

Paul's real name was Elisha Ben Abuiah. The name of *Saul,* which means "a vision of Paradise," denoted his position as a *Chrestos,* or disciple on probation. When he was initiated and became a *Christos,* his name was changed to *Paul,* which means "the little man." As the Initiates in those days were always called "Little Ones," the name of Paul tells its own story.

Paul was a student of the Platonic Gnosis; in other words, of the ancient Wisdom-Religion as it was given out by Plato. This study had given him an impersonal concept of both God and Christ. The God that Paul worshipped was never the personal God Jehovah, but the Impersonal Principle that is indicated by the very word God itself. For this word comes from the ancient Persian word *Goda,* meaning *Itself,* or that which emanates from the Absolute Principle. The impersonal concept of God was considered as a "heresy" by the Jehovah-worshipping Jews, and in another century it was the "heresy" most bitterly fought by the Church. And yet Paul said:

> "This I confess to thee, that after the way which they call *heresy,* so worship I the God of my fathers." *Acts* xxiv:14.

Paul's heretical view of God included an equally heretical view of Christ. He never considered Christ as a *man,* but as a *Principle.* "If any man is in Christ," he said "he is a new creature." And again: "I am crucified in Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

Peter was a conservative, faithful to the old Law, a defender of the Old Testament. Paul was a radical who exhorted his followers to free themselves from the trammels of Jewish dogmatism. "Cast out the bondwoman and her son" (the old Law and the Synagogue) he cried. "The son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman. Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty with which Christ hath made us free; be not entangled again with the yoke

of bondage." Peter was an orthodox Jew, Paul a heretic. Peter was an apostle of circumcision, Paul an apostle of uncircumcision. And yet, in spite of the fundamental differences between these two Apostles, Peter and Paul are claimed by the Roman Church as the "twin-founders" of the Apostolic See.

The average person who wants to know the history of the first century of Christianity naturally turns for information to books written by modern Christian historians, Catholic or Protestant, as the case may be. The Theosophist, following the method suggested in the second object of the Theosophical Society, makes a *comparative* study of the works of different writers, going back, wherever possible, to the *original* sources.

The Reverend Father Stebbing, in the preface of his book, gives us his reasons why Church history should be studied from the Catholic point of view. He says:

> "This is meant to be history; but history from the Catholic point of view. And if there is a tone becoming the Catholic telling the story of the Kingdom of God upon earth, it is a tone of triumph rather than anything else. For the Catholic who tells the history of the Church *knows that it came from God;* knows that it has an abiding presence in it in sunshine and in storm; knows that it must win in the end and on the whole."

This eminent Catholic historian informs us that the Christians of the first century "presented a bright example of the ideally perfect Christian life. All were of one heart, one mind, one soul." But strangely enough, the writings of Peter and Paul tell an entirely different story, and show that the "twin-founders of the Apostolic See," at any rate, were far from that condition. Paul says:

> "When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, for he was to be blamed. For before that certain men came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, I said unto Peter before them all: 'If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?' " *Galatians* ii:11-14.

Paul was a brave, honest, fearless and outspoken man. His rebuke of Peter was not a *personal* one, but was made against the hypocrisy of his actions, and furthermore was *made to his face.* When Peter replied to Paul's accusation, he did not have the cour-

age to come out boldly and openly, as Paul had done, but addressed him under another name, calling him an enemy and a personal rival. But, says Canon Westcott *(On the Canon: page 252)*: "There can be no doubt that St. Paul is referred to as the 'enemy.' " Peter's reply is found in the *Clementine Homilies:*

> "Some among the Gentiles rejected my lawful teaching, and accepted certain lawless and foolish teaching of the enemy. I have followed him as light upon darkness, as knowledge upon ignorance, as health upon disease."

And then addressing Paul directly, although still anonymously, Peter continues:

> "For you now set yourself up against me, who am a firm rock, the foundation of the Church. If you were not an opponent, you would not calumniate me, you would not revile my teachings, as though I were condemned."

The first split in Christianity commenced with the dissensions between Peter and Paul. In a short time these dissensions were between their *followers*. The Jewish Christians were putting pressure on the Gentile Christians by trying to force them to adopt the Mosaic rites and ceremonies. The Gentile Christians retaliated by excluding the Jewish Christians from all hope of salvation. When Justin Martyr was pressed to declare the sentiments of the Church in this matter, he confessed that there were many among the orthodox Christians who not only excluded their Jewish-Christian brothers from all hope of salvation, but who also declined any intercourse with them in the common offices of friendship, hospitality or social life. Therefore, if the statements of the two Apostles and the "most valuable witness to the Faith" are to be believed, the Christianity of the first century was not the expression of brotherly love that the modern Christian historian would have us believe.

The seeds of dissension which were sown in the first century came to full fruition in the second. For by that time the Church itself was split up into two opposing factions. On the one side stood the orthodox Church of Rome; on the other the movement known as "Christian Gnosticism."

THEOSOPHICAL DUTY

NO member has the right to say that Theosophy teaches this, that or the other sort of government or form of law. Forms of government and legislation all pass away. The truth alone remains. Man himself is the greatest truth of all, for he is Truth trying to make itself known.

Under any form of government or any social order men may prosper if they follow the dictates of the soul. It does not follow that either republics or monarchies or empires are the best form. Each age determines for itself those things; and yet Theosophy remains.

There are enough good laws on the statute books to make this an Arcadia, if only men would abandon selfishness and practise brotherhood. But you cannot force the development of a people by laws or revolutions. The first are passed as limiters or agitators; the second result from inherent disorders in the people.

But it is no part of a Theosophist's duty to condemn another member because he upholds any particular law or policy, so long as the Society is not involved in it.

It is our duty to refrain from declaring, too definitely and on insufficient proof that the Adepts, or H.P.B., have said the world is on the eve of war, and that the close of the cycle in 1897 will witness revolutions, or to assume we can alter these events within that time. For the proof is not clear that the Adepts ever said these things, and it is quite plain that no causes for revolutions explodable into such disasters in five years, could be altered by us—supposing them now fixed—in so short a time. I say this in view of statements to that effect made by sundry members.

It is not the duty of a Theosophist to pry into the motives, the means, or the actions of other members. By attending strictly to our own duties we will have enough to do. We cannot know the limitations nor the conscience of any other person.

What is the plain duty of every Theosophist? To read and understand, so as to be able to explain theosophical doctrines. The society has never suffered from outsiders so much as it has from its unintelligent representation by members. The world is full of minds who wish to know, and Theosophists should form clear conceptions of what they think they believe, in order to meet objections, dispel doubts and carry conviction. Such is our duty.

—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

BISMARK AND OCCULTISM

H. P. BLAVATSKY might have had in mind her own limitation as well as that of other true Initiates when she wrote (*Secret Doctrine* I, 558):

> "Occult philosophy divulges few of its most important vital mysteries. It drops them like precious pearls, one by one, far and wide apart, and only when forced to do so by the evolutionary tidal wave that carries on humanity slowly, silently, but steadily toward the dawn of the Sixth-Race mankind. For once out of the safe custody of their legitimate heirs and keepers, those mysteries cease to be occult: they fall into the public domain and have to run the risk of becoming in the hands of the selfish — of the *Cains* of the human race — curses more often than blessings."

Later on in the same volume (page 612) she speaks of the "mysterious help given to rare individuals." Few Theosophists will doubt that the Masters of Wisdom take, indirectly as well as directly, "an active part in the government of the natural order of things," as Mr. Judge writes in the first chapter of his *Ocean of Theosophy*. In the same chapter he gives a brief extract on the subject from a Letter written by one of those very Masters. This Letter was republished in full in THEOSOPHY for September, 1933.

Many students of occult influences in human affairs have heard of "the man in red" who visited Napoleon with warnings on two occasions — warnings, the disregard of which precipitated vast disasters. France and Germany have for centuries been the two foci of disturbance in the elliptical course of European history. It should be of interest, then, for readers to learn of a brief article by H. P. B. in *The Theosophist* for May, 1884, concerning Bismark and Gambetta, the two statesmen who were the focal points of destiny in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Read in connection with her article, "Karmic Visions," originally published in *Lucifer* for June, 1888, and in all probability referring to the Emperor Frederick III, the intuitive-minded may get a glimpse of the forth-coming events in European history. "Karmic Visions" was reprinted in THEOSOPHY for September, 1915. The present is perhaps an auspicious occasion to republish the first mentioned reference to Bismark and Gambetta, which we do herewith under its original title:

PRINCE BISMARK'S MYSTERIOUS VISITOR

La France in an article headed "Chronique Allemande" says about Prince Bismark: "There is no doubt that he works hard,

while undergoing treatment at Kissingen; but it is not religious politics that takes up his time. Although not a single caller is admitted, still a very mysterious visitor comes to him every day. This visitor is a tall, dried-up, old man with grim face and clothed in the fashion of the country of Bavaria, namely wearing, as they all do, silver pieces in place of coat buttons. Certain knowing gossips say that this peasant comes from Pasing, near Munich, that his name is Huber, and that he is nothing more or less than a magician or wizard."

This account, coming as it does from a French source, admittedly unfriendly to Prince Bismark, would appear, at first sight, to have for its object to throw a slur on the Chancellor, and charge him with superstition and credulity. But if we turn to the German Journal *Psychische Studien* published at Leipzig, we find another article headed "Gambetta and Bismark in their relation to Psychism." It shows that several years before Gambetta's death he was dining at the house of a friend, when after dinner the lady of the house proposed a bit of fortune-telling by cards, an amusement that was smilingly accepted. When it was Gambetta's turn to have his fortune told, the lady became suddenly serious. "Do you know," she said, "that you are threatened by a great danger which comes to you through a woman?" "You are perhaps right," replied Gambetta; "my mother was already told before my birth, that she would have a son who would occupy a high position in France, but who would be killed by the hand of a woman."

According to the same journal Prince Bismark is a sensitive. Ideas come to him and keep him awake, when he would prefer to sleep. Who knows but Professor William Carpenter may yet show that the victories in France were but a result of Bismark's unconscious cerebration. Hesekiel tells a ghost story which occurred in Bismark's castle in Schoenhausen; the Chancellor himself saw the ghost and never denied it. He also expressed on a certain occasion his belief in mystic numbers and lucky and unlucky days, and when on the 14th of October, 1870, General Bayer opened negotiations with him in regard to the surrender of Bazaine, Bismark put off the transaction of that serious business, privately giving the reason for it that it was an unlucky day.

Shall we draw the conclusion that these great men are ignorant and superstitious, or that they, perhaps have higher developed intuitions than the ordinary rabble?

A NOTE ON KAMA-LOKA

THEOSOPHISTS almost habitually (and therefore unconsciously) assume that the state of consciousness called *Kamaloka*, the place or plane or world of desires and passions, pertains exclusively to after-death conditions of the "Pilgrim-Soul" called the Ego, the Self of man. We think in the same way of *Devachan* and *Nirvana*, and so of all the "seven worlds".

This is a great mistake. Men rise to the "seventh heaven" and sink to the "lowest hell" over and over again during embodied existence—when awake and when dreaming or sleeping. We forget the synthetic nature of the philosophy and apply it only partially; hence the "dissensions and differences of individual opinion" among Theosophists on so many points of doctrine—just as with the sects and sectarians of the many religions, philosophies and sciences. "*Theosophy* has no two opinions on any subject." *We* do, hence the need to apply from the basis of the *fundamental* doctrines. The closer our allegiance to them, the less room for differences, the greater accuracy of our application to sequential ideas.

Kama-Loka proper is the world of the Elementals, of which there are seven classes, with four of which we deal incessantly in every motion of our four lower "principles". We call them "principles" because they are our basis of *action* in "matter". But in themselves they are the four Elements of "earth, water, air, and fire". There are three *higher* Elements or classes of Elementals which compose our Spiritual form as the exact antithesis of the four-fold human body of "matter". Our "Mind" is neither the one Form nor the other, but a temporary combination of the two.

All these seven worlds, or reducing them to a "pair of opposites", *both* Spirit and Matter, are *actively* present in the living man, who identifies himself, now with the one, now with the other. The seven, or the two, are, in each of us, "in coadunation but not in consubstantiality." During life each individual man deals with both the Spiritual and the Material elements of all Life. He is *always* Perceiver, sometimes Perceiver and Creator, sometimes Perceiver and Creature of his own "creations"—all dependent on his "will and yoga". After death, and until a new birth, he is wholly the Creature, the sufferer or enjoyer of his own creations, in both cases merely the *passive* Perceiver.

LIFE AND THE "LIVES"

OUR physical life on earth during one incarnation may be represented by a curve. The normal individual appears at birth at the zero level, his development taking him upward and onward along the curve till he reaches the zenith of his powers. For a time he seems to continue at an even height as he passes through middle age; but when he approaches old age his vital powers decrease, the curve dips downward, at last the physical body is no longer of use to him, he leaves it and the curve ends at the zero level again. The physical man is dead.

What are the forces that bring about this mystery? How do they accomplish the miracle of living, which is always before our eyes, yet never ceases to puzzle us and to demand an explanation? Theosophy holds the answer to these as to all questions, and establishes the fundamental concept that *Life* is the cause of living, and in it are hid all the mysteries of existence.

Life is a universally pervasive principle. It fills all space, and like all other manifestations is seven-fold. As the manifested One Life is at the summit of the scale of manifestation, so Prana, physical life, is at the base. Prana means "breath", but even so the word is appropriate even in the case of the mineral, for materialistic science of today acknowledges that stones do breathe. The vehicle of Prana is the Astral, or design body. As the astral body permeates the physical, and is the channel through which Prana flows, every particle of the physical body is flooded with life. It enters the astral body through every pore and opening, in every breath we breathe, in our food and drink. It pulsates around and in us unceasingly.

It is from the Central Spiritual Sun, the symbol of the Absolute One Life, that emanates all light and life; but the reservoir of prana, our physical life, is our own radiant sun. Sunlight is not only *life,*—it is veritably *alive,* for it is the result of the intelligent action of a manifesting Host of "fiery lives" which are whirling and moving together throughout the whole body, and beyond it; for they also fill the aura, which extends for a measurable distance beyond the body.

And now, consider the question—How do these forces act? The units of life group themselves together, and with other similar groups form a minute cell, which with other cells helps build a

larger cell. Even this last is microscopic. Of these cells our physical bodies are built up, and by means of them we live; there is no thought or action possible to us without their help. Every act of body or mind is accomplished through the destruction of cells, which sets free the "fiery lives"; we, as it were, secrete life as we live. But the "lives" themselves are not destroyed; they leave the cells in order to accomplish the action of brain or muscle, thus breaking down the cell formation, some of the "lives" passing off into the flood of life that flows through and around us, and some remaining with the waste products of the action, which debris other "lives" in various organs are then busy clearing away.

When, as a baby, man appears on this scene, the "lives" flow in and build new cells more quickly than the child can use them. In this function they are called "Builders". When they furnish force for action—even of the internal, automatic action of the body—they break down the cells and are then called "Destroyers". There is no difference in the life-force; the difference is in the functioning only. Thus it comes about that all action—that is, all living—is accomplished by dying. "There would be no life possible without Death, nor regeneration without Destruction." "In the midst of life we are in death", and Man is truly "The slave of life and death." The life-force pulsates all about us and flows into us without ceasing. As the child grows, the used cells are replaced more quickly than they are destroyed, and the curve of life rises. At middle age the balance is reached, when the use and renewal of cells is equal. But as one approaches old age the action of the "Builders" slows up, the destruction is greater than the renewal, and the life curve tends downward. At last, the limit of the usefulness of the body is reached; the time is ripe, and the Ego leaves the body. The descending curve touches the zero level again, and the man is "dead".

In this connection it is well to be aware that there is another sense in which it is true that "in the midst of life we are in Death". Too much life is injurious, as surely as a lack of it. "The principle of life may kill when too exuberant, as also when there is too little of it." So, though the sun is the immediate source of life, too much sunshine produces sunstroke, which may kill. Too much stimulus, whether physical or emotional, setting free too many "lives" all at once, is always destructive to a greater or less degree, and in extreme cases kills. Here there is a call for the exercise of self-control; otherwise, "Brahma-Vishnu—the creator and Preserver of Life—may transform himself into Siva, the Destroyer."

MEMORY AND IMAGINATION

THE "difference" or the relation between memory and imagination exists in time, not in actuality. The being, the thing, the object or subject remembered or imagined, remains the same whether seen or unseen by us. If perceived, an impression is made in our consciousness, and it is this impression made on the mind which we call a memory or an imagination—accordingly as we observe the eidolon subsequent to the sense-impression or prior to it.

Ordinarily, we regard as "real" those images conveyed to us by our senses, the two most relied upon being our senses of sight and sound which give us two distinct images of one and the same object. The eye does not preserve, the ear does not register, these impressions, but only transmit them to that portion of our nature which we call the mind—in reality our "inner senses", which do the registering and recording automatically.

The use of the "outer" or physical senses is normally automatic, but may be regulated by an act of the will, and is so governed when we desire to observe or listen to any particular object. So with the inner senses, only that their control is far more difficult. Thus, the inner sense registrations originating with objective perceptions are by us named memory.

But the inner senses themselves are capable of transmitting their own impressions derived from other planes of perception than retinal or auditory—in other words, of seeing and hearing in subjective areas that are non-existent to the physical senses. Nothing occurs objectively that does not exist psychically also. When the outer and inner impressions of the same subject or object coincide we have the spiritual sense which we call "reality". If related to senses-external we call the object "matter", *i.e.*, "three-dimensional." If related to senses-internal, we name the "object" a "subject", and call it an "idea", a "two-dimensional" image.

All day long our outer senses are transmitting impressions from the objective to the subjective planes—or, if the words mean more to us, from the physical to the psychic worlds. In the same way and at the same time the inner senses are equally and incessantly active in forwarding impressions from the meta-physical to the physical planes of perception. Both the outer and the inner senses have a life, an activity, a consciousness of their own quite independently

of our use of them. This is but to say that every particle of matter, every erg of force has an existence as relatively independent as our own, and quite apart from our use or non-use of them.

When our will is exercised, whether as to outer or inner impressions, then and then only do *we* "see"—and this kind of seeing constitutes to us what we call the "present". Ordinarily we are conscious of but a minutely small proportion of the transmissions passing back and forth between the various planes of being. In this respect each of us is somewhat in the position of a switch-board operator in a telephone exchange. Only when our will is engaged and rightly trained do we begin to see that the whole universe is a vast wireless as well as wired system, and that our outer and inner senses represent the two phases of this system. It is possible to exercise the same control over our body and mind that the operator does over the switchboard. If the outer senses give us the illusion of a three-dimensional world, our psychical senses the illusion of a two-dimensional, our will or desire gives us a one-dimensional view. The point is that all three views are but images, pictures taken as having a "reality" of their own. These are the so-called "three worlds", whose only actual existence is to and in the perceiving Soul. That Soul is itself "dimensionless", *a fixed center* of reception and projection of images.

What the Alchemists and Rosicrucians called the "powder of projection"—Mercury—has a meaning little guessed,though perfectly transparent to him who has learned to "read" even a little of what he sees and hears. "Mercury", metal or planet, symbolizes Wisdom—*Self*-knowledge. He who is in possession of this "powder" can register or erase any impression on any plane, can correlate the impressions of all planes, can "project" the impressions of one plane on to any other, or withhold them. He can thus make visible what was before invisible to those without this mysterious power, or, conversely, can render invisible what was before perfectly visible.

The pictures taken by the camera-man are afterwards "projected" from the same film which originally received and registered the impression. Although the thousands of pictures were each separately taken, they can be so projected as to present the illusion of being continuous, of moving and speaking as the object originally photographed acted and spoke. "Imagination", then, is the projection in orderly or disorderly fashion of mind-pictures previously registered. Those mind-pictures in themselves are "memory".

"Imagination" carries us forward to future incarnations, as "memory" carries us back to former ones, but when both are carried to their source, that source will be "seen" to be the perceiving Soul.

Thus, memory and imagination are but a "pair of opposites", the same image in duplicate on two planes of perception. Either can be regarded separately, but when both are focussed by the "powder of projection", they become one, and cease to be either memory or imagination. They become "real". The two parallel and identical pictures which can be observed separately or as a duality on the card, when looked at through the lens we call a stereoscope become a three-dimensional "reality". The analogy is well worth looking at with "the eye of wisdom".

METEMPSYCHOSIS

The doctrine of *Metempsychosis* has been abundantly ridiculed by men of science and rejected by theologians, yet if it had been properly understood in its application to the indestructibility of matter and the immortality of spirit, it would have been perceived that it is a sublime conception.

If the Pythagorean metempsychosis should be thoroughly explained and compared with the modern theory of evolution, it would be found to supply every "missing link" in the chain of the latter.

There was not a philosopher of any notoriety who did not hold to this doctrine, as taught by the Brahmans, Buddhists, and later by the Pythagoreans, in its esoteric sense, whether he expressed it more or less intelligibly. Origen and Clemens Alexandrinus, Synesius and Chalcidius all believed in it; and the Gnostics.

For lack of comprehension of this great philosophical principle, the methods of modern science, however exact, must end in nullity. In no one branch can it demonstrate the origin and ultimate of things. Instead of tracing the effect from its primal source, its progress is the reverse. Its higher types, as it teaches, are all evolved from antecedent lower ones. It starts from the bottom of the cycle, led on step by step in the great labyrinth of nature by a thread of matter. As soon as this breaks and the clue is lost, it recoils in affright from the Incomprehensible, and confesses itself powerless. Not so did Plato and his disciples. With him *the lower types were but the concrete images of the higher abstract ones.* The soul, which is immortal, has an arithmetical, as the body a geometrical, beginning.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

PUNAR JANMAN

THE Seven *Saktis* discussed on pages 292 and 293 of the first volume of *The Secret Doctrine* will stand a lot more pondering than Theosophists usually give to the statements made.

Consider one item only, Number 5, *Kundalini Sakti*: *punar janman*—re-birth or transmigration of Souls, the effect of misunderstanding and consequent misuse of Kundalini. These are massed under two antithetical statements:

> (*a*) the fruitless attempts to bring about *"the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations"*, and
>
> (*b*) the equally fruitless efforts to manipulate the *"continuous adjustment of external relations to internal relations."*

Do not these two statements epitomize the entire life-cycle of each man? Do any of us succeed in either of these fruitless struggles—fruitless, that is to say, in giving us "emancipation from the *bonds* of Karma"?

Yet the "continuous adjustment" of relations, external and internal, goes on incessantly. Anon, it brings us into life here, forces us to struggle however vainly, and anon takes us out of this world into another—and so on, through state after state, back again to earth, in unending repetitions, till we learn better. Kundalini Sakti, as a Power, stands fourth in the scale. Our use of that Power is on the fourth plane of nature, and the power itself, plus the effects of our use, constitutes the fourth or middle Principle of our being—"Kama, desires and passions". What are these?

The instincts, tendencies, impulses, habits, the *Skandhas* which constitute as a unit the "human nature" of the race and of the individual—in a word, the effects and resultants of our use of Divine powers and principles, for our *own* sake, and therefore *against* "Nature", "the Universal Life-Principle."

If one turns from study of the above-cited two pages in *The Secret Doctrine*, and considers thoughtfully the "Aphorisms on Karma" as transcribed by Mr. Judge, he may, perhaps, see something of the meaning of "Karma" as universal, not personal, in its operation, and begin to "adjust" his individual *Self* to all "relations", instead of trying to adjust "conditions". *As this is done, it will be found that* "conditions" *adjust themselves.*

YOUTH-COMPANIONS' FORUM

IT is taught in Theosophy that it is Ethics which humanity needs most, yet the article in the Encyclopedia Britannica shows that there are several schools of Ethics with widely differing ideas. Why is it that philosophers cannot agree on standards of moral conduct?

(*a*) When philosophers seek to explain ethics, and the *why* of human conduct through such means as biology, physiology, and other sciences; when philosophers ask, ponder over, and are stumped by the question — "What degree of ignorance will excuse this particular case from responsibility?" — it is clearly evident to the Theosophist that the subject of Ethics is being viewed from a one-life basis.

"The habits and character of men depend upon the material processes which these sciences (physiology, anatomy, biology, etc.) examine," says Rev. Henry Williams, M.A., in the article on Ethics in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Theosophy emphatically contradicts this statement; it goes a step further and inquires into the *origin* of these "material processes." Such investigation brings to light the fact that in past lives we evolved these processes by our thoughts and acts. It points out that Ethics or moral conduct is not the result of these processes, but that rather the converse of this is true. Reincarnation is, therefore, the only means of understanding that we are completely responsible beings, that no degree of ignorance can excuse anybody; that Karma, the law of life — the law of ethical causation — is really the scientific body of ethical knowledge which our philosophers are seeking, if they have not abandoned the hope that such a body of knowledge exists. When philosophers start from a wrong premise, even the best logical reasoning can not result in correct conclusion. Because of a one-life viewpoint, they are bound to find a manifold number of wrong answers.

(*b*) Ethics is defined as the science that treats of the principles of human morality and duty. Scientists, however, have disowned Ethics, as being unworthy of the name of a science because, they say, it contains no proven laws, no foundation of facts or knowledge other than historical information of the standards of ethics that have prompted the actions of certain renowned characters and nations. Having attempted, in the usual inductive manner, the fruitless task of sifting and comparing the moral habits and moral ideas of different peoples in order to obtain a general standard of right conduct,

scientists have generally come to the conclusion that there is no universal objective or moral standard.

Any individual or group of individuals answers the problem of ethics on the basis of what is considered to be the purpose of life. As to this purpose, there are numerous ideas, and for each belief there is naturally a different ethical standard which is supposed to be the means whereby that particular goal is to be reached. Where the purpose of life is undefined — considered unknowable — the field of ethics is even more diversified, because the various schools of ethics are usually based on, and limited to, the particular creed or philosophy of some particular teacher or scientist.

What is the highest good to be aimed at in human conduct? What is its ideal aim which may serve as the ultimate standard of right conduct? These are the questions variously answered by the outstanding schools of Ethics.

"Happiness is the highest good," says Eudaemonism. According to the *Encyclopedia Britannica,* 14th Edition, this branch of the science of ethics teaches that "the popular maxims of all times and climes testify to the widespread belief that in the last resort what man really seeks is happiness and that all his other pursuits are directed (though sometimes mistakenly) at this end."

The question here arises as to whose happiness is to be sought. To answer this question alone three schools have sprung up, namely: Egoistic Eudaemonism, Utilitarianism and Altruistic Eudaemonism.

Egoistic Eudaemonism declares that each individual should seek his own personal happiness. Again there are three points of view for this theory. The crudest of these views is that which teaches that happiness is identified with physical pleasure and sensual enjoyments (Hedonism) — of which Mr. Judge said "a more pernicious doctrine was never taught." A higher point of view believes that individual happiness can be attained through the mind, in intellectual pursuits, and the highest form of this selfish doctrine is that which identifies happiness with the attainment of individual salvation. This includes those who strive for the attainment of the Christian or other religious heavens, and also those whose goal is nirvanic bliss.

Utilitarianism teaches that the highest good is the happiness of the community. Scientific criticism on this is that there is no standard for the attainment of happiness that will cover the needs of the community, because what makes for happiness in one individual's life would be the source of discontent in another's.

Altruistic Eudaemonism teaches that one should strive for the happiness of others at the expense of one's own — self-sacrifice. In commenting on this theory the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says: "But the pure altruism with which we are here concerned can hardly be considered seriously. If the happiness of the agent himself has no value, how can the others be of value?"

The second school which offers an answer to the question as to what is the highest good, is Perfectionism, which postulates that the attainment of perfection — the full development of all the latent capacities of man — is the highest good. They frankly admit that all the latent possibilities are not known and therefore the limit to which perfection may go is not ascertainable. However, they believe that the lives of the great characters of history could serve as examples to be followed.

The third school declares that duty is the highest good. The *Britannica* says in this connection: "Right or good conduct must be judged by the sense of duty which prompts it, not by the consequences which result from it." Kant says: "Nothing in the world is good except the good will."

According to Theosophy, Ethics is an exact science, just as exact, in fact, as the science of mathematics. True ethics is action based on eternal changeless truths. As we know, there is but one fixed and self-evident purpose to life, there can be, therefore, but one definite means to the attainment of that purpose.

The three schools, above mentioned, contain each a partial truth. A synthesis of them all would come very close to the Theosophical teaching as to what is the highest good. The object of evolution for man is to gain full realization of his true nature, to be able to live a conscious existence in spirit while in a body. We may therefore consider the attainment of perfection as the highest good. However, perfection is a very vague term and unless we grasp all the implications that are contained in that term we shall be just as much in the dark as to the object of life, as we were before. To some, perfection pertains only to the gaining of knowledge, of intellectual facts, whereas others call perfection the full application of moral principles. In Theosophy, perfection is the grand combination of both these ideas, taking them of course, in their highest possible sense. Compassion-Wisdom is the equation which equals the grand total — the sum of perfection. Examples of perfected beings have never been lacking. Countless times they have entered into our midst, lived the perfect life and continually pointed out the ways and means to the great goal.

What are those steps? The word Duty covers them all, for through the performance of duty alone will the highest good be obtained. Mr. Judge said: "What then is the panacea finally, the royal talisman? It is Duty, Selflessness. Duty persistently followed is the highest yoga." Under the head of Duty comes not only right moral action, as is the common acceptation of the term, but also does it include the continual use and unfoldment of the highest powers of the mind, an eternal effort for man to know himself. The "good will" of Kant is not sufficient; we must have knowledge and a true basis for action.

As to happiness being the highest good, Theosophy considers it but as a by-product of the right performance of one's duty without desire for reward. It is foolish to believe that the idea of self-sacrifice entails an undervaluation of that which is sacrificed. It is because one sees the great value of happiness, that he is willing to sacrifice it in order to give the precious gift to others; moreover, it is an occult truism that one can only truly keep that which he gives away. Krishna in the *Gita* says: "For those who, thinking of me as identical with all, constantly worship me, I bear the burden of the responsibility of their happiness."

Can we not see the Three Truths in this triad of Perfection, Happiness and Duty? Perfection considered abstractly is that which in an ultimate sense is never to be fully realized for we *are* it. Duty is the "self-induced and self-devised efforts" which brings us forever closer to the goal, while happiness forever follows in the footsteps of duty, in accordance with the law of harmony and equilibrium. The Masters are said to be the happiest of beings because they love to do their duty.

Last year the name of Helena Petrovna Blavatsky was one of those considered by a committee from New York University for putting in the Hall of Fame. Her contribution to the science of ethics was one of the causes for the appearance of her name. In the following statement by H. P. B. we can find the highest standard for ethics: "Our duty is to drink without a murmur to the last drop whatever contents the cup of life may have in store for us, to pluck the roses of life only for the fragrance they may shed on others, and to be ourselves content but with the thorns, if that fragrance cannot be enjoyed without depriving someone else of it."

Would you say that the American idea of an ethics based on pragmatic philosophy and the Theosophic idea of a scientific basis for ethics are the same thing?

The philosophical definition of "pragmatism" runs as follows: (1) Kantianism — Having to do with those rules of action that tend toward the attainment of happiness. (2) The doctrine that practical results are the sole test of truth.

The first definition requires further elucidation, since every one is following rules, self-made or otherwise for the attainment of happiness, which itself has as many given meanings as it has seekers. Part two will be recognized as the good old American doctrine of ethics, particularly in business where "The end justifies the means" and "Honesty is the best policy" *if* "It *pays* to be honest." In social life, the good American abides by the golden maxim, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," but unknowingly transmutes it into a gilded rule by his attachment to the results of action.

H. P. B. referred to Kant as the flower of European philosophers, ranking him with Leibnitz and the Eastern Occultists. Kant, the Transcendentalist, who understood the reality of the metaphysical, based his ethics upon a Universal foundation, the Good of All. He taught the need for performing one's duty for duty's sake. *The Encyclopedia Britannica,* 11th Ed., cites Kant as follows: "The dictates of reason," he points out, "must necessarily be addressed to all rational beings as such; hence my intention cannot be right unless I am prepared to will the principle on which I act to be a universal law." He considers that this fundamental rule or imperative act on a maxim which thou canst will to be a law universal supplies a sufficient criterion for determining particular duties in all cases. The rule excludes wrong conduct with two degrees of stringency. Some offenses such as making promises with the intention of breaking them we cannot even conceive universalized; as soon as every one broke promises no one would care to have promises made to him. Other maxims such as leaving persons in distress to shift for themselves, we can easily conceive to be universal laws, but we cannot without contradiction will them to be such; for when we are ourselves in distress we cannot help desiring that others should help us. Kant's followers who comprise Kantianism, lacking the perception to rise above materialistic thinking, view his philosophy from below upward and mistaking the illustration of the principle for the principle itself, interpret him as meaning that we should act from a universal basis, but expressly for the personal benefit of the individual concerned. Thus Kant and Kantianism bear a somewhat analogous relation to Christ and Christianity. It would therefore appear that this interpretation of Kant has been imported from

Europe and now constitutes the American philosophy of pragmatism, where ideals are impractical, since the sole test for truth is practical results and happiness is the prime incentive for action.

Boiled down to a few words, pragmatism stands for this —"Live and let live," as opposed to the jungle law, "Kill or be killed." Contrasting as these two viewpoints may appear, both are activated by the same basic motive — egoism. Pragmatic philosophy is simply the outgrowth of the practices of civilization, formulated to its highest logical conclusion and documented as ethical philosophy. It is purely a product of cold, materialistic, inductive rationalization; a commercial bartering for security and happiness.

What possible fallacy or harm, it might be asked, can there be in a philosophy which aims at making the individual act for the mutual benefit of all concerned?

From the Theosophical viewpoint the primary fallacy in this code of ethics is the fact that it incites to action with *the hope of reward.* This attitude binds the ego to "the wheel of Life" causing rebirth after rebirth till the lesson of unattachment to results is learned. Secondly, such a philosophy could hardly be made to include everyone. Since each one bases his actions with an eye to reaping benefits, what incentive could there possibly be for helping those who are destitute and who can in no way return benefits received? Would not such be in danger of neglect or even harm? To offer a more concrete example, was not the "League of Nations" formed with the pragmatic idea of "mutual security" as the motive? Has this League helped the weaker nation to any great extent? Are there not in this "civilized" day and age compelling examples of the stronger nation pledged to respect and protect the weaker, shamefully betraying that trust because of greater benefits to be derived from self-justified invasion?

Theosophy furnishes the only true, absolute basis for ethics, because it is the complete philosophy of life, leaving nothing and no one out. Starting from the truly universal basis that "All is Life" and that "Life is One," it at once gives us the absolutely scientific basis for Brotherhood, namely, the common source of all beings in the universe. Karma, the second great Truth, gives each one the only self-compelling basis for exact ethical action, for it teaches that effect as well as cause cannot be separated from the actor. As we sow we reap, Jesus taught his followers. The purpose of Life which is essentially the "realization" through thought, feeling and action of

the complete Unity of all Life concludes the scientific basis for ethics of the Masters of Wisdom.

The relationship between Theosophy and all other systems of thought is an interesting one. Impelled by ignorance and desire, men's minds sway back and forth like a pendulum, from one pole of thought to the opposite, resulting in the incessant rise and fall of civilizations, nations and peoples, depending upon the ideas held by them. The two poles of thought are in reality only "relative knowledge" which permits of no rest for the weary, but ever a swinging back and forth through its two poles. Only the few realize that at the radial center of this pendulum motion is to be found the unchanging, motionless pivot, the ever-fixed axis about which the mind oscillates. That axis is Truth — "Absolute Knowledge" — Theosophy, without which the two poles could not exist. It is to this center that the mind belongs.

Can it then be said that an ethics based on pragmatic philosophy and the Theosophic idea of a scientific basis for ethics are the same thing?

THE WORK OF THEOSOPHISTS

Our work, then, is a plea for the recognition of the Hermetic philosophy, the anciently universal Wisdom-Religion, as the only possible key to the Absolute in science and theology.

The drift of modern thought is palpably in the direction of liberalism in religion as well as science. Each day brings the reactionists nearer to the point where they must surrender the despotic authority over the public conscience, which they have so long enjoyed and exercised.

Centuries of subjection have not quite congealed the life-blood of men into crystals around the nucleus of blind faith. The day of domineering over men with dogmas has reached its gloaming.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

PHASES OF KARMA

POLARITY can be regarded as a power, as the exercise of that power, as the affects and effects of that exercise. This is but to state in other words the "three fundamental propositions" of *The Secret Doctrine.*

Usually we think of "Karma" in its secondary sense, "action", and almost always of its third aspect in a personal sense: *our* "Karma", *i.e.,* what happens to us. Yet over and over we are taught, "Deity *is* Law, and *vice versa.*" Whether called Deity or Law (Karma) or by any other name, the One and only Principle is eternal and uncreate. This is the first fundamental. *In* this "Omnipresent, Eternal, Boundless, and Immutable PRINCIPLE" is the power of Self-polarization, which is ITS alternating activity and repose.

It follows that "every atom in manifested Space" is identical *in esse* with the PRINCIPLE, *is* that Principle "anywhere and everywhere", possesses in itself the same power of self-polarization. Whether regarded universally or in particular, the instant that Identity becomes self-polarized, it presents a cycle of two phases—those opposite characteristics called Spirit and Matter.

Neither the phase called Spirit nor the opposite phase called Matter can be apart from the other: there are either *two* poles—or none, either manifestation or non-manifestation, but all the time one and the same Reality. Matter is as much Life as Spirit, one is essentially as real as the other—and as unreal. Consider the Moon in its two-phase cycle, its "dark" and its "full"—all the time it is the same moon. So with all things and beings. We are in the dark or in the light, in the first or second or third or fourth quarter sequentially. A four-phase cycle means simply that *both* Spirit and Matter have become bi-polar in Nature. The "inorganic" represents the negative pole of matter, the organic its positive. Similarly the will and the mind represent the two poles of Spirit. The "four Elements" and the "four kingdoms" represent the four "quarters" of the *Monadic* cycle, one half of which is passed, so that the human race represents as a whole the "full moon" stage of Matter—which reflects to the maximum the Light of Spirit or Self, the Sun in Nature and in Man. Each Pilgrim-Soul is the Power, is its exercise, is its fruits or results. To know this for one's Self is to have completed "the Grand Cycle of Necessity".

THE PLACE OF MIRACLES

ON a certain day, Rabbi Eliezer Ben Orcanaz replied to the questions proposed to him, concerning his teaching; but his arguments being found to be inferior to his pretensions the doctors present refused to admit his conclusions. Then Rabbi Eliezer said, "My doctrine is true, and this Karoub tree, which is near us, shall demonstrate the infallibility of my teaching." Immediately the Karoub tree, obeying the voice of Eliezer, arose out of the ground and planted itself a hundred cubits farther off. But the Rabbis shook their heads, and answered, "The Karoub tree proves nothing." "What," cried Eliezer, "you resist so great a miracle? Then let this rivulet flow backwards, and attest the truth of my doctrine." Immediately the rivulet, obeying the command of Eliezer, flowed backwards towards its source. But again the Rabbis shook their heads and said, "The rivulet proves nothing. We must understand before we can believe." "Will you believe me," said Rabbi Eliezer, "if the walls of this house wherein we sit should fall down?" And the walls, obeying him, began to fall, until Rabbi Joshua exclaimed, "By what right do the walls interfere in our debates?" Then the walls stopped in their fall out of respect to Rabbi Joshua, but remained leaning out of respect for Rabbi Eliezer, and remain leaning until this day. But Eliezer, mad with rage, cried out: "Then in order to confound you, and since you compel me to it, let a voice from Heaven be heard!" And immediately the Bath-Kol or Voice from Heaven was heard at a great height in the air, and it said, "What are all the opinions of the Rabbis compared to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer? When he has spoken his opinion ought to prevail." Hereupon Rabbi Joshua rose and said, "It is written: 'The law is not in Heaven; it is in your mouth and in your heart.' It is in your reason; for again it is written, 'I have left you free to choose between life and death, and good and evil.' And it is in your conscience, for 'If ye love the Lord, and obey His voice within you, you will find happiness and truth.' Wherefore then does Rabbi Eliezer bring in a Karoub tree, a rivulet, a wall, and a voice to settle questions of doctrine? And what is the only conclusion that can be drawn from such miracles, but that they who have expounded the laws of nature have not wholly understood them, and that we must now admit that in certain cases a tree can unroot itself, a rivulet flow backwards, walls obey instructions, and voices sound in the air? But what connection

is there between these observations and the teaching of Rabbi Eliezer? No doubt these miracles were very extraordinary and they have filled us with astonishment; but to amaze is not to argue, and it is argument, not phenomena, that we require. When therefore, Rabbi Eliezer shall have proved to us that Karoub trees, rivulets, walls, and unknown voices afford us, by unusual manifestations, reasonings equal in value and weight to that reason which God has placed within us to guide our judgment, then alone will we make use of such testimonies and estimate them as Eliezer requires."

—THE TALMUD.

DO WE REMEMBER?

Once, as a young girl, I travelled in Italy for the first time. As the train proceeded on its way I felt excited and restless, and annoyed my family by wandering in and out of the carriage and remaining in the corridor most of the time.

Suddenly I became quiet, seating myself on a little flap stool affair by the window. I felt I knew where I was going and what I would see.

The train was climbing slowly, and — "round the next corner on the right there will be a church perched upon a hill, isolated, dominating the scene with no village adjacent" — and there it was.

Then again — "here on the left will be a stream, tall dark trees growing, and later, masses of trees with silvery leaves, crowding up a hillside." Why "silvery," I wondered. My knowledge of trees was limited; I had never seen olive groves, and some one told me what they were as they came into view.

Never again have I felt, as I did then, that I was travelling a land I knew well, although to my knowledge I had never seen it before.

Had I, as a peasant woman, trudged up that hillside to the little church? Or perhaps, wandered in pagan abandon among the cypress trees and olive groves? I wonder . . .

[Re-printed from *Vancouver Sun Magazine,* Nov. 16, 1935. The experience there given is signed, with address of writer.]

STUDIES IN KARMA

The Course of Empire

A RECENT plebiscite, taken by an organization whose specialty is ascertaining public opinion, revealed the fact that the majority of the American people desired extension of the power of the Federal Government and curtailment of that of the States. It is significant of the future that the younger voters were more in favor of this move than their elders. It was also significant that this revelation took place at a time when nearly all the influential journals were in hot protest against the recent enlargement of Federal power instituted under President Roosvelt. Significant, because it shows the set of some current too strong to be damned even by the power which ordinarily rules us—the press.

To liberal economists, the immediate reasons for that current are apparent enough. With a Government purporting to be that of a single nation, we have been doing business as though we were forty-eight independent nations—this in the face of the fact that much of our business has now become nation-wide. Such stresses were set up in the national economic fabric that some means had to be sought to equalize them lest the entire system break down into chaos. Some men who saw this most clearly in 1932 and would brook no denial of national coördination are now among those most frantically against the price that must necessarily be paid for that service.

All this is but the inevitability of a cycle through which all empires pass in their turns. To begin it, a series of nations or tribes enter into relationships, either by alliance or conquest, which sooner or later brings an ever closer coördination of their local governments. The increasing closeness of relationship leads at last to centralization and the loss of local autonomy. The complexity of the problems to be handled by the central power then become too much for any bureaucracy. The once-firm ties rot away, leaving the constituent elements to undertake once more their own evolution, precisely as takes place at any other death. Then, based upon modified groupings of the ancient tribes or states, a number of new powers rise, born amid blood and tears, pursuing the same old course.

Where is the vast empire that once existed where blow the

sands of the Gobi now? It is represented by Tibet, Mongolia, and the scattered, unclassifiable fragments of a hundred "lost tribes." What became of the great realm of Asoka, of Akbar? Broken into a multitude of native Indian States, now officially or unofficially provinces of Great Britain. Where is Rome? It is France, England, Germany, Egypt, Greece, Spain, and a polyglot litter of quarreling entities scattered over Europe. Spain? She has become the realm of nations that stretch from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn. Great Britain? Fast dissolving into the new nations: Canada, Australia, Ireland, the Transvaal, New Zealand—*and India.*

Seen thus, the present trend and status of the United States is clear enough. Following the ancient cycle, it is evolving by steps from separateness to integration; from a scattered group of unimportant seaboard colonies into a close-knit empire; to be, perhaps, more closely welded than any empire that has ever existed, because of unprecedented speed of communication and mutuality of interest. Periodically must crises come where the alternative is closer integration—or disintegration.

In reality, our men of power are pawns on the Karmic chessboard; they must move in the appointed direction regardless of party, power, or pledges. He among them only can be called great who sees the course he has to take, and follows Karma knowingly rather than blindly. The ship of State moves in its preordained direction. The only questions are two—how many times will it be half-shattered, damaged, dented with irreparable leaks that might have been avoided by wiser pilotage; and how much farther might it have gone whole than it *will* go? Washington, and Paine, the Creators, and Lincoln, the first, but we hope not the last, of the Preservers: they all saw this. But in the very power of preservation lies destruction; the close-knitting that is again and again forced in itself brings about the smothering, the oppression, the impractical hugeness of growth, that means death in the end.

In the very surge of a new wave of integration nearly paralleling that following the Civil War, the new nations of the future raise their heads. "Regionalism" is a doctrine eagerly embraced by a few daring political thinkers, contemptuously condemned by a few others; as yet not taken seriously by the many.

But what does it mean? It is simply a proposal to obliterate State lines, and to reform the forty-eight into larger new local Governments delimited by community of local interests. Arguments advanced for this are many. The folly of supporting forty-

eight Governments where a half-dozen will do the work; the better coördination of national problems possible with fewer local centers; the higher type of government possible with larger units—well illustrated by the fact that County Governments are in general less corrupt than city, State less than County, and National least of all. If it should be carried out, the new "Regions" will be the seeds of the new nations that must arise in time.

There is nothing absurd about an individual providing for the disposition of his body and property after death; still less so, the biological preparation for subdivision that goes on in a living cell which has reached its term. Since this is the law of national cycles also, why should not the process be rational, instead of irrational, perverted, often bloody and violent, as it now is? True, if the limits of natural subdivisions were predetermined scientifically, and afterward formed the bases of real and viable nations, it would be for the first time in history. Yet we have a close parallel in the peaceful current liquidation of the British Empire, its dissolution into what in reality is the British League. And this is the only manner in which an empire can end without incurring in the process both internecine strife and foreign conquest.

The British nations are as strong against conquest, in their free-willed unity, as they ever were when forced to be formal and nominal parts of a single system. And the sooner England applies to India the lesson of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, the better for all concerned. True, there are many difficulties in the way as concerns the welfare of both governor and governed; but they are not insuperable. To retain as part of the body politic, and by force, entities which by the law of Nature should be free to pursue their own evolution, is as bootless as for parents to try to keep their children in the nursing stage all their lives.

How long may be the life-cycle of the United States? It is hinted by Madame Blavatsky that by a certain time we will have "become a new race and many new nations." Elsewhere it is stated that when the sun of the new race rises, "there may be no United States for it to rise upon."

Using the analogy of Rome, our own former national incarnation and nearest of kin in spirit and institutions, we find that from the foundation to the revolution against the Etruscan Kings was about 300 years, as against 150 years for the corresponding period of our own life.

Her period of conquest and expansion lasted for about 350

years, as against our own 150. As with us, internal difficulties supervened upon the close of that expansion, and the social wars began. The transition state to the Empire lasted some 70 years or so; the Empire itself began with Augustus, who retained the republican form on paper but so manipulated it that the representative branch was a mere social club without power.

From the beginning of the Empire to the end was 500 years, marked by alternating periods of light and darkness, integration and disintegration, none of which turned aside the steady march to imperial death. The rise of the provinces as independent powers and new nations became marked some fifty years prior to the official end of the Empire. If, then, we are to draw a parallel based on the vast acceleration of the typical cycle as exemplified in America, we may expect a death-struggle between conflicting ideals of government, just now becoming incipient, *about 1975*. A few hundred years thence, we may expect the United States in its present form to come to an end, which if wisdom prevails during the rest of this century, the crucial period, we may expect to be peaceful and beneficial, like the freeing of the British Dominions.

To envision the whole picture, it is necessary to realize that the United States is but *part* of the Roman reincarnation, Great Britain being to all appearance the other major portion. And the United States represents culturally and philosophically much more the Eastern Empire, which itself endured through a thousand years of independent existence, while the Western Empire and the Europe that followed it fell into a thousand years of deepest night.

But that which is all-important, Theosophically speaking, is that the "moment of choice" for this nation will, to all indications, practically end with this century. The crucial stage will be coincident with the coming of the next Agent of the Great Lodge. What He can accomplish within his period of opportunity will without question be determinative, not only as to our history but as to the nations to follow us—crucial as to the empires that are to rise and dissolve southward of us, all playing their parts with us in the evolution of the New Race. And in turn, what He can do will depend very, very greatly upon the means, which latter is in the hands of the current generations of Theosophists.

MATERIALISM AMONG THEOSOPHISTS

BEHIND the two equally Scholastic expressions, "Spirit" and "Matter," lies the unperceived truth that both are one and the same Substance, and hence that the two schools of thought represented by religion and science champions each a half-truth.

Theosophical students can easily see in the foregoing an application of the famous "Three Fundamental Propositions" of *The Secret Doctrine*. But it is open to question how far Theosophists apply these propositions either to the phenomena of Nature or to themselves and their fellow men. When directly placed in contrast with prevailing views, for example, how could any Theosophist fall into either the theological or the materialistic pitfall from which have developed the schisms which now separate one group and society from all others? It would be a refreshing and enlightening change if students were to begin to search out the roots of their own troubles, individually and collectively.

"The tendency of Matter," says H. P. Blavatsky, "is to run into form." Theosophists have largely given their loyalty and their energies to this or that society, this or that assumed successor or leader, to the neglect of the writings of the original Teacher and her Colleague, Mr. Judge. The result has been materialism in Theosophy, followed by Psychism which is but materialism on another plane of nature and of man.

Quoting again from the Teacher: "We have no two beliefs or hypotheses on the same subject." How could *Theosophy* have variant, let alone contradictory, teachings on any subject soever? More one studies the extant writings of H. P. Blavatsky, Wm. Q. Judge, Robert Crosbie, more one compares, contrasts, verifies for himself their statements, more he will be certain of their entire consistency and concordance. Thus we have the original Messenger, her foremost Disciple, and a devoted "common soldier" in the army of the Theosophical Movement, whose lives and whose writings are *one,* as the Wisdom-Religion itself is declared to be one, unchanging and indivisible.

On the other hand, let the student take the writings and the conduct of any or all of those who have assumed or usurped the role of teacher and submit them to the same dispassionate inquiry. He cannot fail to observe the discrepancies, the absurd as well as contradictory and confusing theories and hypotheses put forth as Theos-

ophy. This is the fact, whether as regards the writings and the practices of any particular successor or authority in himself, or in comparison with his competitors for "the mantle of the prophet," or, most telltale of all, when placed in contrast with the original recorded Message of H. P. B.

From the very commencement of the Theosophical Movement, H. P. B. was at war with both materialism and theology, whether in orthodox science, dogmatic religion, or their illegitimate offspring, spiritualism. The "Three Objects" of the Parent theosophical society were but a formalization, a materialization of the Spiritual Movement "for the better comprehension of our finite minds." At once the Fellows began to take the *Society* seriously. Others as seriously devoted themselves to the Third Object — as they interpreted it to mean; still others to the Second Object; a few, a very few, to the consideration of the great First Object.

Soon H. P. B. found herself forced to wage internecine war within the Society itself if it was to be saved from becoming simply one more among the countless failures. After fourteen years she formed the "E. S. T." as a "forlorn hope" that a working model of what a theosophical association should be might be preserved. That, too, failed even more completely than the original exoteric Society itself. Within the fateful closing years of the century and the close of the five-thousand-year cycle of *Kali Yuga* four antagonistic societies, four irreconcilable "esoteric sections," sprang into existence, each pursuing its own divergent and hostile career — all under the banner of Theosophy and the Theosophical Movement! Dozens of "occult" bodies sprang up like toadstools, as has been the case ever since.

What does all this betoken but materialism among Theosophists? How is this sectarian and dogmatic perversion to be excised? How else than by a return to the prime source? The beginning has been made in The United Lodge — and Lodges — of Theosophists. But it is only a beginning. True students everywhere, in every society or outside them, must take up the burden of hope and responsibility — weed themselves of materialism, work for the restoration of the unity of Teaching, its study, its application.

ON THE LOOKOUT

"Infidel Missionaries"

When Mrs. Pearl S. Buck spoke and wrote with the rare courage of sincere and informed conviction on the quality and character in missionary work in China, what was the reaction in the great Presbyterian Church? No one could question her integrity any more than her candor and her first-hand knowledge, but for all that she was assailed and, in the end, forced out of the Church by those who should surely have been first to profit by her instruction. Sectarianism was demonstrated to be the real interest of the ruling powers, not any aspiration, however misguided, for the welfare of the "heathen." There have been truly great missionaries in every Evangelical communion as among Roman Catholics, but these have ever been the exception. Genuine Christians, they have been so despite, not because of theological dogmas and influences — humanists, not sectarians nor profiteers interested in their own advantage or that of their sect. It must be a question whether Christian troops or Christian missionaries have worse represented the ethical mission of the Man of Galilee. Now comes a still darker indictment, and from within the fold. As reported in the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin* of April 15, 1936, these are the salient facts:

"The Inside of the Platter"

The Rev. Donald G. Barnhouse, pastor of the Tenth Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, recently made an investigation of foreign missions in India. Upon his return he commended the majority of the missionaries, but warned that "there are cases of existing unbelief in Presbyterian supported work, of which our Board is reported to have full knowledge." Dr. Barnhouse has addressed an open letter to the Board of Foreign Missions in which are charges that "deceit" was practiced in order to make him believe that missionaries are not "Modernists." He reminds the Board that it promised to make public a further report on conditions, but has not done so. The Rev. Charles H. Dyke, a foreign missionary, has written a strong letter to Dr. Barnhouse, from which the latter quotes. This letter says that the missionaries "took their infidel books off the shelves until the storm was past." He says to Dr. Barnhouse:

> "They were warned you were on a heresy hunt and deceived you well. I was told that they even went so far in Allahabad as to actually put that Brahmin youth up to speaking to you that he wanted to become a Christian."

"Children of Satan"

The *Mission News Notes* is quoted to the effect that Dr. Barnhouse's investigation was a "heresy hunt," not an attempt to observe mission work and its results. An ambiguous statement puts into the mouth, whether of Dr. Dyke or the *Mission News Notes* it is hard to determine, the following unadorned declaration:

> "This sentiment about the Fatherhood of God (to include all men) and the brotherhood of man is satanic. It is not found in the Bible. We become sons by adoption. The Hindu is not a child of God, but a child of Satan."

"We Blandly Lie"

Dr. Dyke is further quoted:

> "We blandly lie as a mission by recording the fact that we appreciated your visit. You were far too generous in your estimate of the orthodoxy of missionaries and I am absolutely convinced that you could not say of our North India mission, 'the vast majority is personally devoted to our Lord Jesus Christ.' "

Dr. Barnhouse comments on Dr. Dyke's uncompromising assertions:

> "The letter of Mr. Dyke so completely stunned me that I am presently at a loss to know how best I can further serve the missionary work of the Church. The letter is a challenge to the integrity and value of my report, as it is to a situation under your charge. It is my hope that the Board may so publicly and promptly act that all Presbyterians will, without reserve, reach the conclusion that the Board recognizes the imperative task confronting it and eliminates all causes of possible further doubt of its intention to do so."

Hypocrisy in Protestantism

Who doubts that in every Protestant Church orthodoxy in profession, heterodoxy in private, is the rule and not the exception? Whatever the particular set of dogmas or Church credo to which the minister has subscribed, the more informed the preacher the more "suspect" his fidelity. It is this widespread unbelief in the very

doctrines they expound to the faithful that has turned Protestant Christendom into a stagnant pond of infected waters. Whatever the actual sins of omission and commission of the Roman and Greek Catholic faiths, they are comparatively free from hypocrisy among priests as well as laymen. "Catholicism is a religion, Protestantism a profession," Robert Crosbie was wont to say. Who can doubt the accuracy of the summarization? But so long as true-hearted clergy or members like Mrs. Buck, Dr. Barnhouse and Dr. Dyke live and battle for honesty versus hypocrisy in religion, there exists room for hope of a revival sadly needed — simple sincerity and integrity, intellectually and morally, in the Churches as outside of them.

MORE ON CLAIRVOYANCE

Indications accumulate that "science" will some day make the startling discovery that "things which have life are alive," and perhaps also that time is as indivisible as space. Thence, perhaps, we shall witness the announcement that "science" has discovered that since all things exist in indivisible space and time, it must follow that "past" and "future" events can be seen the same as "present." Already we have Dr. Alexis Carrel daring to assert these heterodox facts, and thereby raising a chorus of dissent and denial. Already General Smuts and Chunder Bose have raised their own voices in as sane fashion as Dr. Carrell. Who knows but that reincarnation and Karma will be discovered by the all-seeing eye of "science" as inhabiting "this expanding universe"? With the "personal God" receding as rapidly as the stars into "outer space," perhaps we shall soon witness the dogmas of "science" as much on the defensive as those of religion, and the "orthodox" materialists in the same psychopathic ward as the theologians. Hence, in the gallery of true Science a couple of other pioneer names should be added to those mentioned. Encouraged by Dr. William McDougall, head of the department of Psychology, Dr. J. B. Rhine has conducted experimental research for some years at Duke University. He adds his testimony to Dr. Carrel and the others:

> "The conclusions from the Duke experiments are that both telepathy and clairvoyance are demonstrated by many normal human beings if the right conditions are provided, but they are both very delicate capacities and are commonly not discoverable."

Dr. Rhine advises further that the experiments indicate that the mind is not governed by the laws of mechanics as most psychologists

have been inclined to think. "Rather," he asserts, "it is distinctly non-mechanistic, at least in these unusual capacities."

Death and Survival

Dr. Rhine indulges himself in some remarks couched in portentous terminology on the analogical significance of his investigations:

> "If these differences from ordinary physical phenomena are sustained in future experiments, they will indicate a strong departure from any known mechanical interpretation of extra-sensory perception.
>
> "Our results have a bearing on the problem of the survival of life after death. They show that the mind has powers not dependent upon the senses, an assumption that is made under the theory that life can exist apart from the body.
>
> "[But] by proving that such powers exist in the normal body, the problem of securing scientific evidence of survival becomes one of still greater difficulty."

In other words: It will be some job to secure sense-evidence of what, *argumenti gratia,* is beyond the range of the senses. There are times, despite our great respect for Science, when our own researches lead us strongly in the direction of the conclusion that "science" is unable to distinguish between its head and its top-hat, and, consequently, broadcasts through the latter many of its "latest discoveries."

Gold in Sea-Water

A world-old and world-wide legend that sea-water contains disseminated gold in minute quantities is often repeated. Readers of Theosophy will be interested to learn that Dr. William E. Caldwell of Oregon State College undertook to verify at first hand the extraction of gold from Puget Sound water. Using mercury for a precipitant he recovered from .02 to 1.2 milligrams of gold per ton of the water. Infinitesimal as is the proportion, it requires but slight computation to determine what an immensity of the precious metal exists in the ocean.

Gold Alone A "Pure Element"

We hear so much nowadays about the "elements" — nearly a hundred as classified — that it is worth recording some recent experiments with gold. Dr. A. J. Dempster, physicist of the University of Chicago, asserts that gold is the one known substance

which is really entitled to the term Element. Most so-called elements, he says in a letter to *Nature,* have closely related brother and sister atoms in their immediate family, but none has been found for gold. Contrary to accepted theories that gold, like other chemical substances, should show two atomic weights, he says:

> "It is very probable that gold has only one component, and that the accepted atomic weight is too high."

"PRIMITIVE" AMERICANS

Searching for a "lost city" in Central Ecuador, the Andes-Amazon Expedition of the Museum of the American Indian discovered an "ancient road built for amazing durability," according to the New York *Times* of Feb. 12, 1936. The account of the find is given by Henry M. Hardwicke, geologist of the party.

> Mr. Hardwicke told how he and other members of the expedition had toiled up the "Cerro Hermoso," a sacred mountain of Indian legend, on the other side of which the "lost city" is supposed to lie. They ascended 18,000 feet and finally were driven back by torrential rains and the increasing opposition of their native guides to continuing the search, because they feared violation of ancient Indian taboos. The guides told them forgotten cities lay on the slopes of the mountains, but that they were haunted and held inviolate by all natives.
>
> The road discovered by the party was a "marvel of engineering," Mr. Hardwicke declared.
>
> "It was six feet wide, paved with cut stone and carefully graded," he said. "There were remains of bridges over some of the streams. We did not find the terminus of the road, although we followed it for thirty miles, cutting our way through the rank undergrowth. Thus, it is impossible to fix the date of construction. But we know it was at least pre-conquest and from its condition we would judge it to be early Inca or pre-Inca."

The "ancient Indian taboos" which the explorer describes are an apt reminder of a passage in *Isis Unveiled* (I, 598):

> Around no other locality, not even Peru, hangs so many traditions as around the Gobi Desert. In Independent Tartary this howling waste of shifting sand was once, if report speaks correctly, the seat of one of the richest empires the world ever saw. Beneath the surface are said to lie such wealth in gold, jewels, statuary, arms, utensils, and all that indicates civilization, luxury, and fine arts, as no existing capitol of Christendom can show to-day. The Gobi sand moves regularly from east to west before terrific gales that blow continually. Occasionally some of the

> hidden treasures are uncovered, but not a native dare touch them, for the whole district is under the ban of a mighty spell. Death would be the penalty. Bahti — hideous, but faithful gnomes—guard the hidden treasures of this prehistoric people, awaiting the day when the revolution of cyclic periods shall again cause their story to be known for the instruction of mankind.

Has the time arrived for the story of the city of "Cerro Hermoso" to be known at last? "Torrential rains" and "increasing opposition of native guides" seem to have ruled otherwise. However, Mr. Hardwicke plans a return trip to Ecuador next year.

"Life is Light, Both are Electricity"

This statement in *Isis Unveiled* is, now essentially, the "novel" conclusion of Dr. George Washington Crile, noted Cleveland surgeon, after forty-nine years of observation in active practice and laboratory research, set forth in his book, *The Phenomena of Life*. Dr. Crile's interest in this all-engrossing problem dates from his first day as an interne, when, according to newspaper accounts, he was deeply impressed by the gradual death from shock of a young medical student, which led him to spend his life in an investigation into the "nature of life". In the world of surgical science Dr. Crile is known as the first man to perform direct transfusion of blood. His wide experience includes that of the vivisection laboratory, where he "studied the effect of shock on animals", and long years in the operating room.

Dr. Crile's Theory

A summary of the main contentions of "The Phenomena of Life" is given by a reviewer in the New York *Times* of February 28, 1936:

> He conceives that we are all electrically operating; that our bodies are systems of generators, conductance lines, insulators and infinite numbers of thin films for holding electric charges; that we are adapted to oxidation just as gasoline engines are; that because we are exquisitely sensitized to radiant and electric energy, we are detonated, oxidized and exhausted readily by physical injury, by emotion, by infection.
>
> For the further development of his radio-electric interpretation of the phenomena of life, Dr. Crile makes way for an imagined physicist who has never seen the light and has no knowledge of the solar system. If that physicist, he says, should make

measurements of radiant energy and should determine the solar spectrum, he would logically reach the conclusion that there was at a long distance a radiator of vast power; and finding by comparison only a slight amount of radiation from other sources, from the moon and stars for example, he would appropriately name this great source of radiation the "primary radiogen."

Now if, he continues, this same physicist had found radiation of the same wave length in the same bands emitted by the protoplasm of plants and animals while alive, but not emitted at death, absent at death and after, he would conclude that there were secondary radiators in protoplasm.

He would go on to find that the secondary, or re-radiation, in protoplasm was related to oxidation solely; that oxidation was controlled by the nerve cells of the brain and the nerve cells of the sympathetic system, and that the nerve cells of both systems were adaptively speeded up or lessened in activity by the thyroid and adrenal glands, which in turn are controlled in their adaptive activity by the brain and adrenal-sympathetic system, while the brain, in turn, is controlled by the special senses.

ESSENCE OF THE LIVING

Continuing in his search and finding that the special senses, in their turn, are controlled by light waves, sound waves, chemical influences, etc., he would yet note that a persistent pattern of energy transformation exists. And he would realize that there are continuing forces at work which keep the pattern of the mechanism of energy transformation as constant as the energy which produces those forces are constant. And after investigations of the chemical and physical nature of protoplasm, he would realize that the spectrum of the living state is produced and maintained by a constancy of the protoplasm through eons—the constancy of the wave-lengths of solar radiation, the constancy of iron, the constancy of water and electrolytes, the constancy of electricity, the constancy of the wave-length which each atom of nitrogen, carbon and oxygen brings to the radiogens where it is released to maintain the flame of life.

"THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN"

It is reported that Paul Redfern, American aviator who disappeared more than eight years ago, is a captive among primitive tribes of South America. This word is brought by Dr. Morton C. Kahn, of New York, who headed a scientific expedition into Dutch Guiana recently. In an interview printed in the New York *Times*

of Feb. 12, 1936, Dr. Morton describes the conversation he had with an Indian which led him to believe that the white man said to be living among the tribes of the interior is perhaps Redfern.

> "This Indian claimed that this man, who may be Redfern, fell from the sky, and made a sound like an airplane motor to indicate that he was an aviator," Dr. Kahn said. "He also said that the Indians recognized Redfern as a white man and not as a god. They called Redfern by a special name, Tukkuyena, while other white men are known as Panscheeree, which means 'those who kill their friends.' "

Apparently rumors of our great western culture have penetrated even the fastnesses of the South American bush.

"Living Dynamos"

A discovery correlative to that of the University of Illinois investigators is one announced by Prof. Edwin J. Cohn of the Harvard Medical School, described in the New York *Times* of April 13, 1936. Under the heading, "Vast Network of 'Living Dynamos' Supplies Electric Power to Body," is given a detailed account of giant protein molecules, some of them from 34,000 to 5,000,000 times larger than the hydrogen atom, which, having positive and negative charges of electricity, are thought to generate the currents that transmit the nervous impulses through nerve fibre from brain to muscle. These currents, the *Times* reporter writes, "are believed to be intermediaries between the realms of mind and matter, somehow linking the material and the immaterial, the tangible and the intangible." We quote:

Scientific Facts and Fancies

> The molecules of the proteins, lipoids and amino acids, according to the Harvard findings, may be pictured as forming a chain. Since the molecules are so large, the positive charge tends to concentrate on one end and the negative charge on the other.
>
> Because of the great distance between the ends, the molecules become, in effect, a magnet. If broken in two, the respective halves would be ions, or electrified particles. Since these molecules have two poles they have been named "dipolar ions."
>
> As "dipolar ions," it was explained, they have an electrical, or magnetic, effect on surrounding charged particles. A positive charge outside of the molecule will find itself drawn toward the negative pole of a nearby molecule and repelled by another molecule's positive pole.

The amount of positive and negative charge present in a molecule, multiplied by the distance between the charges, gives a measure of the electrical effect, the strength of which is known as the "dipole moment."

A "dipolar ion," it was found, becomes oriented in its surroundings, so that its negative pole will turn toward the greatest near-by positive charge, and its positive pole toward the greatest near-by negative charge.

In a chain of "dipolar ions," it was explained, an electric current may be set up in the following way:

STILL "SOMETHING NOT YET KNOWN"

Something, not yet known, causes the positive end to lose its charge. The negative charge on the other end immediately moves toward the positive end of the adjoining molecule. Thus a current moves along the entire chain, and is discharged in a muscular contraction.

In other words, an electric current has been found to travel down a nerve fibre in this fashion: A negative charge from an adjoining cell comes in contact with the positive end of a dipolar ion and discharges. The dipolar ion's negative end then loses its charge to the positive end of the next dipolar ion in the chain.

This takes place all along the line of the molecules that compose the nerve. The molecules line up and discharge, then line up and discharge again.

MAGICIANS OF THE FUTURE

That it would be the destiny of physiology to open the eyes of mankind to great physical truths was a prediction of H. P. Blavatsky which is receiving ample confirmation in the discoveries announced almost daily in the newspapers. The present cycle of "revelation" is dominated by the theme that "life and consciousness" are "largely electro-chemical phenomena," a contention immediately recalling the *Secret Doctrine* statement that "Light is Life, and both are Electricity." It is tragically regrettable, however, that the magician, Physiology, has for the traditional wand substituted the vivisector's scalpel. Grim foreboding of the fury of an outraged nature yet to break about our heads lies in the fact that Crile, Carrel, and many others who are making the scientific "news" of the day are all schooled in the horrors of the vivisection laboratory. The Karma of Atlantis darkly clouds the perspective of the race and the taint

of that ancient sin is a veritable Proteus in its manifestations, emerging even in the inquiries of "pure" science, only to turn to dust and ashes (for the Theosophist, at least) the literally thrilling findings of laboratory workers.

A report in the New York *Times* of March 29, 1936, tells of the work which has been carried on by the scientists of the physiology department at the University of Illinois, in measuring the flow of life currents in a living organism, in a state of deep "unconsciousness." The subject, an animal, was anesthetized and an electrode placed on its cerebral cortex, the other electrode on the exposed sciatic nerve. A delicate galvanometer was connected between the two. This arrangement led to the following observations:

Consciousness and Electricity

> Consciousness in an animal was found to correspond to a tiny current of electricity, constantly flowing to the nerves from the cortex, seat of the intelligence in the upper front layer of the brain.
>
> Consciousness seems to be a matter of electrical balance between the brain cortex and the nerves, the Illinois physiologists reported.
>
> When the animal was conscious a tiny electrical current, two to three millionths of an ampere, was observed, in a delicate galvanometer, to flow from the nerve to the brain.
>
> When the animal was in a state of deep unconsciousness, while under ether, the current was seen to be flowing in the reverse direction, from the brain to the nerve.
>
> The scientists reported being able to control at will the direction of the flow of the "stream of consciousness." Each time they placed the animal under anesthesia the stream began flowing from the brain to the nerve. When the effect of the anesthesia wore off the current was seen to reverse itself gradually, until, when complete consciousness was regained, it was flowing in the opposite direction, from nerve to brain.
>
> To put it in another way, when the electrical potential of the cerebral cortex is notably higher than the electrical potential of the rest of the nervous system the animal is "conscious"; when the electrical potential of the nervous system is higher than that of the cerebral cortex "unconsciousness" results.

A Theosophical Statement

These processes of going to sleep and waking again are simply and solely the restoring of equilibrium in sleep and the action pro-

duced by disturbing it when awake. It may be compared with the arc-electric light wherein the brilliant arc of light at the point of resistance is the symbol of the waking active man. So in sleep we are again absorbing and not resisting the Life Energy; when we wake we are throwing it off. But as it exists around us like an ocean in which we swim, our power to throw it off is necessarily limited. Just when we wake we are in equilibrium as to our organs and life; when we fall asleep we are yet more full of life than in the morning; it has exhausted us; it finally kills the body. — (*The Ocean of Theosophy.*)

TEKTITES

Here and there are to be found small glass bodies running from minute particles to several ounces in weight, and for which no known origin has been ascertained. These bodies are called "tektites." One generally adopted theory conveniently ascribes them to fusion of silicates by meteoric impact, but Fletcher Wilson Jr. of Harvard Observatory denies this possibility, chiefly, it appears, because they have been abundantly found in Australia, where no silica rocks exist, so that the tektites could not have been so caused. Another theory attributes the tektites directly to meteors — that is, that they don't "belong" to earth, but are brought here by falling meteors. So here is another mild mystery for the minds which delight in speculation. But then, glass itself, natural or man-made, is likewise a mystery, although our familiarity with it blinds us to our ignorance. So also is ice, and so is mercury. There are solids which behave like liquids, liquids which have appropriated characteristics ordinarily pertaining to solids, and gases which seem to be on "familiar terms" with both liquids and solids. We enjoy forgetting that we know nothing but the bald fact of that baffling series of metamorphoses called "states of matter" — no more than we know of that mysterious ante-natal conditioning which has resulted in the four kingdoms of nature. By and large everything we assume to "know" about is something of a "tektite" on its own account.